Re my unhappiness over the "editing" of NEVER AGAIN! 3/3/95

I have retrieved from the file only two letters I recalled. They are attached. They confirm my belief that the promises made me were not kept. Had they been virtually none of the corrections I made with strong emotions perhaps hampering what I did would ~~not~~ have existed in the page proofs. But the fact is that from the time I returned the editing by Kevin Adler I heard not another word until recently Raphaela sent me the copy editor's work. I never saw the manuscript again. When months ago I asked for a copy as it then stood Gallen did not respond at all. When I got the copy editor's work it was with a letter telling me it had already been sent to the printer. I then was asked to return the proofs almost immediately and I did do that, with corrections on them and with notes added when necessary or when I felt up to that. I had no time to read the copy-edited version. When I saw it that was my first knowledge that it had been retypred. I was not given a copy of that and as I noted earlier, that apparently was done before I sent the ~~copy~~ Epilogue up. It and the Afterword were not retyped. I am certain that ~~some of~~ the stupid editing did not exist in anything I saw and am equally certain that Kevin Adler is not responsible for them or for some of the rewriting.

Because what was sent to the printer is not what I last saw, the promise in the first paragraph of Skutches' letter of June 3, 1993 was not kept. ("...you will have full opportunity to correct and advise") because that was limited to Adler's first ~~editing~~ all I ever saw.

At least some of what was promised in its third paragraph was not done, particularly the quotation of me.

The there is the fourth paragraph, which says that as soon as it is gone over again by Adler it would go to the copy editor.

I'm sorry. I've confused two of Skutches' letters. Except for the one citation of his June 3 letter they are references to his of July 30. I'll continue with that letter.

That seems to confirm the intention to published that September, which Gallen had told me they would.

I do not recall getting the draft of the catalogue he said he enclosed. I could have and forgotten it.

There came a point when in response to my questions about non-publication Gallen wrote me that it was not publishable. That should be compared with what Skutches says of it in his 6/3/93, especially the first, third and fourth paragraphs on page 1. (I agreed with his third paragraph and am surprised that in the proofs it is a long as it is.) I think these are rather high praises, including for the writing. Referring to Chapter 24 as "more than brilliant" is a high praise. (I think that was the chapter on pictures worth more than a thousand words as I wrote it.)

The first full paragraph on his second pages says, "Where questions arise as to authorial intent, you will be consulted." That never happened. In more than a year and

a half.

His last words are rather complimentary about the book, the method I used in writing it and about me.

No doubt that is what made it unpublishable to Gallen!

I would have been less disturbed by some of the changes and excisions if it were not that the innumerable mistakes the copy editor made in the copy editing itself, many hundreds of them, and because of the possibility they can undermine the book.

And, of course, reflect on me.

To illustrate with what is so glaring there was no need to touch what in such a book the editor had to know from the first would be used often. There are, according to my Random House unabridged, two correct spelling for "X-ray," the way I used it throughout. It indicates that "x-ray" is preferred. Therefore the editor, who considers herself more of a maven that the unabridged, changed almost all the mentions to what is not a correct version, "X ray." Including with quotation marks, including in what I used as verbatim transcripts of official records, including in what I quoted from my earlier books, and sometimes did not change it within paragrpahs, more often within pages. She even added [sic] after it in official records and transcripts.

Because she sometimes edited what did not need editing at all, to the point where I wondered about correctness and checked the unedited rough draft, in most of those cases she introduced errors that are not in the rough draft. I did not check all of it that way. Did not have the time. But in the course of checking I could not help but notice the extent of the excisions. I was all for eliminating the repetitions that should have been eliminated, was far from the very first when have called a few to my attention. But some of what I saw excised was intended repetition, as in made in making an argument or in arguing a legal case. As against Specter, for one example. As in making the case for an official government conspiracy not to investigate the crime itself. (Consistent with ~~the later~~ my subtitle that was entirely eliminated. I did not know of this until I saw the picture of ~~it~~ the cover in the page from the C & G catalogue Raphaela sent me. When I asked that it be restored on the title pages, Raphaela gave the message from Skutches that it would be. The elimination itself violates all the promises made me because I was not consulted on it.

I do note that it was more than a year before Skutches seems to have been given the book of which he had so high an opinion and, as Raphaela told me lond ago, when he learned that Gallen was not going ahead with it promptly argued that he should, that it should be published as soon as possible. She did not say "rushed" but I got that impression.

When I told Gallen of what I was doing the July 4,1992 weekend I also told him I wanted it published as soon as possible, while I was still alive, when I could respond to any criticisms. He nodded his head, which I took to mean assent. Of course it need not have meant that but doing that and not meaning it that way was to deceive.